



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Prince of Achaia and the Chronicles of Morea, a Study of Greece in the Middle Ages. By Sir RENNELL RODD, K.C.M.G. Two volumes. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1907. Pp. xvi, 301; iv, 334.)

THE history of Greece during the two centuries and a half between the capture of Constantinople in 1204 by the Fourth Crusade and the destruction of the Greek Empire in 1453 has never been satisfactorily written. Materials exist in considerable quantity and have accumulated recently through the efforts of Hopf and others. The various narratives which serve as sources for such a history are written from many points of view, and the attempt to construct the story as a whole has a tendency to become a series of family and disconnected narratives. Taken separately many are romantic. The difficulty comes in the attempt to weave them together. Sir Rennell Rodd has attempted the task of bringing the narratives into some kind of connexion so far as relates to Achaia and the Morea. Finlay in his *History of Greece* from 1204 to 1453 covers a larger field, though he does not give in such detail the story of Achaia. Sir Rennell Rodd has given to his particular subject much careful research. He writes clearly and in certain places also he is able to add useful local color from his own observation. As in his previous book on Greek customs, he shows his sympathy with the population of Greece and tells the stories of some of the barons in an interesting manner. As a contribution to the history of the period his work will always have the value which attaches to an independent examination of the authorities. Where it fails is, that it does not attempt to give an account of the condition of the population and that it makes no attempt to connect the events related with the history of Greece as a whole or to show their relation to that of Eastern Europe. This is the more remarkable because Sir Rennell Rodd precedes his narratives with an account of the sack of Constantinople in 1204 and the division of the Empire, though he tells that prefatory story in a quite imperfect manner.

Upon the capture of Constantinople, the Empire west and south of Salonica was divided among the crusading leaders. The provinces were peopled with peasants who wished only to be left at peace and fell an easy prey to invaders. The only method of government which the leaders knew was that of the feudal system and they at once parcelled out the southern half of the Balkan peninsula into fiefs. The arrangement might have worked if the Latin emperors had been actual rulers. The fatal fault of the system was that there were soon a number of competing overlords. Of course the emperor on the Bosphorus was the one to whom under a properly organized feudal system all the greater and smaller barons should have been subject. But while some so regarded him, the greater number looked up to the king of France as their lord, others to the king of Naples, while others held under the

Republic of Venice. The Latin bishops who were appointed wherever the crusaders held rule did homage only to the pope. As each overlord was usually jealous of his prerogatives and privileges, there entered at once the element of discord. Barons supported by their lords were constantly at war with each other.

Meanwhile the population, mostly Greek, was harassed by exactions and by liability to services. Although among the rulers during the period treated of some were competent yet the characteristic note is the disregard of the population except as objects of extortion.

There is nothing in history quite like what happened in Greece during the two centuries after the establishment of the Latin Empire in 1204. A weak empire, a hostile population, a crowd of knightly adventurers, the chance of carving out kingdoms and duchies, two competing churches with prelates, priests and people in bitter opposition, all created a situation difficult to match. Many illustrations of the confusion and struggles which resulted are furnished by the author. Especially noteworthy is the story of the Villehardouins, who conquered the whole west coast of the Morea, succeeded in getting themselves recognized as Princes of Achaia, made terms with Venice, and held their own till 1245.

As the thirteenth century closes, we find the quarrels between the western barons in Greece and their overlords still continuing. Isabella Villehardouin became sole ruler of Achaia. In 1307 she and her husband bartered their claims in Achaia for certain lands and titles in Italy under Charles II. of Naples.

Though the Latin Empire had come in 1261 to a well-deserved end, the western barons continued for a century later to dream of its restoration. To realize this dream, they were aided by some of the popes. Much energy, ingenuity, and persistency was displayed by the Angevins and especially by Philip of Tarentum in trying to concentrate in themselves all the supposed claims to the throne of Constantinople. Sir Rennell in order to account for this, suggests that there still existed a belief that the "legitimate traditional seat of the Empire was in Byzantium"; that the popes held that the re-establishment of such empire in its "immemorial place" seemed a natural solution and therefore worked for it. But the suggestion will hardly bear examination. "One God, one church, and one emperor", had ceased to have any hold on Western men after the memorable coronation of Charles the Great on Christmas day 800, unless with the idea that the seat of the empire should be in the West. There is not a jot of evidence known to me that would suggest that either pope or king in the West wished it to be at Constantinople. Moreover at the particular period of which the author is speaking Philip le Bel was a more powerful personage than the pope, and no one would venture to suggest that Philip would have been in favor of the transfer of the seat of empire to Constantinople. Angevins and other claimants for the throne of Constantinople were

simply intriguing and fighting for their own hands. Each one wished that if an empire should be re-established he might be the emperor and though every year rendered such an event less probable, the chance of it was worth bearing in mind.

Sir Rennell points out that such chivalry as had existed in the Morea had vanished by the beginning of the fourteenth century. The history of that century is one of struggle and confusion and the complete breakdown of the feudal arrangements from which much had been hoped. Among the incidents which completed that breakdown he rightly attaches importance to the action of the Catalan Grand Company. Although they played their most mischievous part in preventing the Greek emperor from offering successful resistance to the Turks their lawless adventures have also an important place in the story of the Princes of Achaia. The authority mostly relied upon in these volumes is that of one of the adventurers; for, though Pachymer is quoted, his version, clear and without undue partiality, is practically disregarded, and their history until 1309 will not be correctly gathered from these volumes. After the departure of these buccaneers from the Greek Empire, they pushed on into Macedonia and Thessaly, took sides with one or other of the various claimants, and in 1311 in an important battle fought at Lake Copais secured victory against what Sir Rennell speaks of as the "finest fighting force the Franks of Romania had ever mustered", numbering some 8,000 foot and 6,000 horse. The bandits practically annihilated the knights. Without joining the author in his admiration for the knights generally, it may yet be admitted that some of them had been fairly good rulers and were certainly better than the adventures by whom they were beaten.

By this time everyone had become afraid of the Catalan Company. Popes and kings anathematized or disowned them. In 1313 the Venetians attacked them in Euboea. The pope urged the republic to uphold Christendom against "the sons of perdition" who were working by means of infidel Turks. They had made of the Piraeus a pirates' nest. They managed however to hold on notwithstanding the ban of excommunication, which was only removed in 1346 by Clement when he wanted their aid against the Turks. Their rule in Athens lasted seventy years and came to an end in 1386.

Of the adventures of the princes of the mercantile house of Acciaiuolo, of Leonard Tocco, and of others it is impossible to speak here except to say that in the narrative of their adventures a novelist may find abundance of incident. The transfer of authority to the Knights of Rhodes, who took that title about 1309, is almost the final phase of the history of the principality of Achaia. But by this time the confusion was at its worst. Companies of condottieri appeared who were ready to sell their swords to the highest bidder. The Greek emperors were gradually regaining their hold over the country and there can be little doubt, that it was a blessing to the population when the adminis-

tration of the country fell again under the rule of Constantinople. The dissensions among their rulers had made the peasants welcome even the Turks. Zacharia, the last prince of Achaia, obtained that dignity in 1404. On his death some thirty years later the Morea was once more mainly in the hands of the Greeks and the reign of the Frank barons was at an end.

Sir Rennell Rodd's narrative is usually accurate. I should like to know what authority the author has for stating (I. 277) that Andronicus II. (1282-1328) reduced the famous Varangian Guard. I am writing on an island in the Marmora without my books, but I recall no traces of such guard at so late a period. Moreover why not call the Varangians, Warings? Following Rafn and Hyde Clarke I have shown the connection between the Varini of Tacitus, and the Warings who settled in England and left their name in Waringford, Waringwic or Warwick, Warington, etc., as well as in the not uncommon family name of Waring. Sir Rennell Rodd says (I. 269), that "The name is no doubt identical with *φράγγοι*, Frank, Feringhi, foreign." I have no doubt that it is not identical. He quotes a chrysobul of Alexius I. where they appear as *Πόστων* and as *Βαρπάγγων*. Bede also calls the Warings, Russians, in enumerating the three branches of the Teutonic race by which Britain was colonized. Villehardouin calls the guard "les Anglois et les Danois". No contemporary author confuses Warings with Frenchmen and Italians, who were Franks. The derivation given by the author is no longer accepted. They were Warings whose language was understood by the English who after the conquest of England in 1066 joined their ranks. Their appearance as described by Leo the Deacon shows them to have been like Saxons and Angles. Sir Rennell implies that the famous guard was unknown before the eleventh century. Here again he is mistaken. The Emperor Murzuphlos was not flung from the column of Arcadius upon the marble pavement of the forum of Taurus in Constantinople (I. 68), for the column is more than a mile distant from that forum. The general opinion is that the execution was from the column of Constantine known now as the Burnt Column.

In conclusion it may safely be said that the volumes under notice are valuable for the parts relating to the Morea though they show traces of haste elsewhere. If the author could find time to cut the two volumes down to one, omitting such parts as have no immediate connection with his subject and revising the rest, his book would be improved and have a distinctly greater historical value.

EDWIN PEARS.